

Manuscript: “**Analyse descriptive et facteurs agronomiques d’avant-garde de l’état sanitaire des vergers anacardiens (Anacardium occidentale L.) en Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 20 August 2020

Accepted: 06 October

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding author: Soro Sibirina

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p72](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p72)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mamam Toleba
Université d’Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)

Reviewer 2: Kouame Konan
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly De Korhogo (Côte d’Ivoire)

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Ir. Mamam S. TOLEBA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin).	
Date Manuscript Received: 31.08.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 02.09.2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse descriptive et facteurs agronomiques d'avant-garde de l'état sanitaire du verger anacardier en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Acceptable	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Peut mieux faire	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Peut mieux faire	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Tenir compte des observations de l'Examineur	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Un bon texte, sujet d'actualité. Les Auteurs sont appelés à procéder à une relecture plus approfondie, afin d'améliorer la qualité scientifique de l'article. Tenir grand compte des observations de l'Examineur surtout dans les citations bibliographiques. Bon courage !

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Le document peut être accepté sous réserve de prise en compte des observations faites par l'Examineur.